

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and further examination are requested.

Claims 1, 4-13, 17, 18 and 21-26 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 4-13, 17, 18 and 21-26 stand rejected. Claims 1 and 23-26 are amended herein. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 4-13, 17, 18 and 21-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Luciw et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,390,281) (hereinafter referred to as “Luciw”) in view of Clancey et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,216,098) (hereinafter referred to as “Clancey”).

Claims 1 and 23-26 have been amended to further distinguish the present invention, as recited therein, from the references relied upon in the above mentioned rejection.

The above-mentioned rejection is submitted to be inapplicable to the amended claims for the following reasons.

Claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Luciw and Clancey, because claim 1 recites an information terminal device for executing, based on an operation input by a user, a function corresponding to the operation, including, in part, an anticipated operation supporting section for comparing an actual next operation, which is newly input from an input section after an operation anticipating section has anticipated a next operation, with the anticipated next operation, and providing the user with a notification only when the anticipated next operation is different from the actual next operation.

Luciw discloses a method or process that uses a significant observation about a new event for deducing user intent and providing computer implemented services. Upon identifying a significant observation about a new event, the process attempts to recognize a possible intent. If a possible intent is recognized from the new event, an actual intent of the user is hypothesized. The hypothesized user intent is executed if such factors as whether all preconditions to execution have been met, and whether the user requires confirmation prior to execution. The hypothesized user intent is not executed if a non-continuable or fatal exception occurs.

Once a new event has occurred, it is matched against one or more entries in a knowledge base. As used in Luciw, the term knowledge base refers to a collection of specialized databases having entries corresponding to significant events. When there is a match into the knowledge base of an event (such as by a word, pattern, shape, or opportunity) then a significant event has occurred. A significant object set corresponding to the significant event is determined and is matched against a number of task templates. The significant objects in the significant object set are matched against precondition slots for each task type. The match of any significant observation into any precondition slot results in at least a partial match to the set of templates. Analogous types of templates can be used for other significant object sets. A confirmation requirement can be set by the user for various services depending upon the user's level of confidence that the system will perform correctly. If confirmation is required, the user is asked if the service should be executed.

In contrast to the present invention, Luciw does not disclose anticipating a next new event based on a new event and comparing an actual next new event with the anticipated new event inputted by a user after the anticipation is made, and notifying a user only when the anticipated next new event is different from the actual next new event. Instead, Luciw discloses comparing a new event with a knowledge base to determine if a significant event has occurred, then compares significant objects of a significant object set to determine at least a partial match to a set of templates that can be used for other significant object sets. Moreover, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Luciw to anticipate a next new event based on a new event and to compare the actual next new event with the anticipated next new event inputted by a user after the anticipation of a next operation is made, and to notify a user only when an anticipated next new event is different from an actual next new event. In other words, Luciw does not disclose an anticipated operation supporting section for comparing an actual next operation, which is newly input from an input section, after an operation anticipating section has anticipated a next operation, with the anticipated next operation, and providing the user with a notification only when the anticipated next operation is different from the actual next operation.

Regarding Clancey, it is relied upon in the rejection as disclosing an anticipated operation supporting section for comparing an actual next operation, which is newly input from the input section, after the operation anticipating section has anticipated the next operation, with the anticipated next operation, and providing the user with a notification when the anticipated next operation is different from the actual next operation. Clancey discloses a simulation tool (Brahms) for simulating working behavior that includes a number of computer program modules.

A general Brahms communication model may contain a number of protocols. The Brahms technology can be used to build what is known as an intelligent or software agent. The intelligent agent includes a situation specific component including information 154 used and maintained by a comparator. Information 154 indicates, for example, the history of the agent's activities, interests and preferences of the user, such as the areas in which the user would like assistance. The comparator runs models in a forward looking mode, for prediction, and in an explanatory mode, to support its diagnostic and didactic functions. The comparator compares predictions generated by the model with the actions of the user. Differences, issues or problems that are of interest are identified by the comparator, and these are formulated by an advisor process 156 to provide assistance or teaching to the user 144.

The Examiner asserts that the “predictions generated by the model” correspond to the “anticipated next operation” and that “the action of the user” corresponds to the claimed “actual next operation.” However, the predictions generated by Clancey are not based on both an operation inputted by the user and on operation history information. As discussed above, the predictions are based on the history of the agent's activities, interests and preferences of the user, such as the areas in which the user would like assistance. A particular action, or activity, of the user is not taken into account in determining the prediction. Instead, particular actions of the user are only taken into account when comparing the predictions with the particular actions of the user.

Moreover, the Examiner asserts that providing assistance or teaching to a user 144 when differences, issues or problems that are of interest are identified by the comparator corresponds to providing the user with a notification when the anticipated next operation is different from the

actual next operation. However, there is no correspondence because amended claim 1 requires providing a notification to a user only when the anticipated next operation is different from the actual next operation. Thus, it is clear that Clancey also fails to suggest or disclose the above-discussed features of the claimed information terminal device as recited in claim 1.

For the above reasons, it is believed clear that claim 1 is not anticipated by Luciw. Further, it is submitted that there is no teaching or suggestion in the prior art of record that would have caused one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Luciw in such a manner as to result in, or otherwise render obvious, the invention of claim 1. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 1, 4-13, 17, 18, and 20-22 are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

Regarding claims 23-26, they are patentable over the reference relied upon in the rejections for reasons similar to those set forth above in support of claim 1. That is, claims 23-26 each similarly recite, in part, an anticipated operation supporting section for comparing an actual next operation, which is newly input from an input section after an operation anticipating section has anticipated a next operation, with the anticipated next operation, and providing the user with a notification only when the anticipated next operation is different from the actual next operation. These features are neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited reference.

Because of the above mentioned distinctions, it is believed clear that claims 1, 4-13, 17, 18, and 20-26 are patentable over the reference relied upon in the rejection. Further, it is submitted that there is no teaching or suggestion in the prior art of record that would have caused the ordinary artisan to modify Luciw in such a manner as to result in, or otherwise render obvious, the invention of claims 1, 4-13, 17, 18 and 20-26. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 1, 4-13, 17, 18 and 20-26 are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

In view of the foregoing amendments remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner believe there are any remaining issues that must be resolved before this application can be pass to issue, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Kazuomi KATO

By: Kevin McDermott
Kevin McDermott
Registration No. 48,113
Attorney for Applicant

KM/km
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
November 21, 2007